

11 SEP 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr.

SUBJECT : Critique of the Seminar, "The Government Executive and Management Science," 8-11 September 1970

The following numbered statements are in answer to the questions asked (attached).

1. When one speaks of management science, they are referring to quantitative analysis which this seminar barely touched and couldn't in the time allotted. The subject was so broad brushed as to be of little or no use to me.
2. The seminar did not meet my expectations. I was led to believe that OCS arranged the seminar to enable managers to have a better understanding of computers and their use as a management tool. Our inputs to the time sharing computer were for mathematical computations only and offered little understanding of the computer other than that it (or the teletype) and the program often don't work right.
3. I do not see the use of linear programming, decision trees or mathematics as a device to the decisions my job requires. I cannot easily quantify the choices, constraints, and probabilities in my decisions or recommendations, and if I could I'm not sure I would. I had a full course at the ICAF on scientific decision making that went far beyond the coverage of this short seminar and I have not found that knowledge of much use to me, so this capsule offering was of even less value.
4. They should be directed to Agency decisions, not just the four or five we have used but the hundreds of thousand daily decisions we face. Since I'm not a quantitative analysis advocate, I would not try to revamp the seminar but rather abolish it.
5. This type seminar might be useful for the Agency Operations Research technicians who know well the myriad of techniques but who could assemble in a seminar to exchange ideas as to their applicability to problem-solving of Agency problems.
- 6., 7., and 8. The quality and effectiveness of instruction was outstanding. The instructors knew their subject thoroughly and presented it in a lively and interesting way. Although I cannot honestly say I returned to my job better equipped in any way to do it, I will say I thoroughly enjoyed the experience of

listening to and participating in the seminar. It was a first class group of top professional instructors who presented their material in a manner to keep the audience interested and stimulated.

9. I think my comments above support my conclusion that the course as offered to the type group assembled was not worth \$8,000 nor was it worth \$333 to me. I firmly believe any education is good, it stimulates the mind and offers challenges one does not meet in the daily routine of the job. So I benefited, no doubt, but it is difficult to "price-tag" the benefit. But to place a price on direct job-related benefit, I would have to say something a little above zero.



Executive Officer to the
Deputy Director for Support

STAT

Attachment

EO-DD/S:WEB:es (18 Sept 70)

Distribution:

Orig - Adse w/att

1 - DD/S subject

1 - DD/S chrono

DD/S 70-3488

19 AUG 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training

SUBJECT : The Government Executive and Management
Science Seminar

REFERENCE : Memo dtd 12 Aug 70 from Exec Dir-Compt to
DD/I, DD/P, DD/S&T, DD/S, D/DCI/NIPE,
GC, LC, IG, D/ONE, same subj

1. Listed are the five Support Directorate officers selected to
attend the Seminar cited in referenced memorandum:



GS-16	O/DDS
GS-15	Office of Security
GS-15	Office of Finance
GS-16	Office of Communications
GS-16	Office of Logistics

2. Attached are biographic profiles of the selected officers.

SIGNED R. L. Bannerman

R. L. Bannerman
Deputy Director
for Support

Atts

O/DD/S:NFD:sm (18 Aug 70)

Distribution:

Orig & 1 - Adse w/att

✓ 1 - DD/S Subject

1 - DD/S Chrono

1 - STO/DDS w/ref (DD/S 70-3404)

SECRET

